R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 015 538 24 EA 000 951

ISSUES AND PROBLEMS IN CONTEMPORARY EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION. A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE. SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT.

BY- GOLDHAMMER, KEITH AND OTHERS
OREGON UNIV., EUGENE.

REPORT NUMBER BR-6-2423-SR PUB DATE AUG 67
GRANT OEG-4-6-062423-1720
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$2.60 63P.

DESCRIPTORS- CULTURALLY DISADVANTAGED, *EDUCATIONAL PROBLEMS, *SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS, *EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION, *EDUCATIONAL CHANGE, COLLECTIVE NEGOTIATION, SCHOOL SUPERVISION, LEADERSHIP, SOCIAL PROBLEMS, EDUCATIONAL FINANCE, *ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHIES, INSERVICE EDUCATION, BOARD ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIP, FEDERAL AID, COMMUNITY INFLUENCE, RACIAL INTEGRATION, EUGENE.

SOME 138 ARTICLES, RESEARCH REPORTS, AND UNPUBLISHED ITEMS, DATING FROM 1953 TO 1966, CONTRIBUTED TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF A RATIONALE FOR A MAJOR STUDY OF PROBLEMS FACING PUBLIC SCHOOL SUPERINTENDENTS. BRIEF REVIEWS COORDINATE THE MATERIAL UNDER SIX MAIN HEADINGS--(1) EDUCATIONAL CHANGE, (2) NEGOTIATIONS AND TEACHER MILITANCY, (3) ASPECTS OF INSTRUCTION, (4) ADMINISTRATIVE LEADERSHIP, (5) CRITICAL SOCIAL ISSUES, AND (6) EDUCATIONAL FINANCE. (JK)

ED015538

BR-L-2423
P.A. 24

Issues and Problems in Contemporary Educational Administration

A Review of Related Literature

A Supplementary Report

Project No. 6-2423
Grant No. OEG 4-6-062423-1720

U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

EA 000 951

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SUPPLEMENTARY REPORT

A REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

To

ISSUES AND PROBLEMS IN CONTEMPORARY EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION

Project No. 6-2423
Grant No. OEG-4-6-062423-1720

Keith Goldhammer
William D. Aldridge
Gerald L. Becker

August, 1967

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Negotiations - Teacher Militancy	14
Instruction	18
Administrative Leadership	23
Social Issues	40
Finance	48
Bibliography	52

Introduction

As part of the activities under a grant with the United States Office of Education for a study of issues and problems in contemporary educational administration, a review of literature related to this topic was undertaken. Preliminary to the formulation of instruments and the collection of data for the study, a vast array of materials including books, doctoral dissertations, research reports and journal articles were reviewed. Following the collection of data for the study itself and the categorization of the issues presented by the school administrators in the field, the review of research was recategorized to conform with the analytical structure posed in the final report.

Although several hundred items were reviewed, there is actually very little basic research on the problems of educational administrators or an attempt to determine the basic problems which confront educational administrators. Most of the material reviewed consisted of off-the-cuff analyses of problems with the writer's subjective evaluation of how a problem could be solved or resolved. Much of the literature could be classified only as descriptions of problems made on the basis of the author's limited perspectives of the milieu in which the problem exists.

In the pages that follow, some 138 articles are mentioned. A few of these present significant research undertakings, while others are subjective analyses of issues, and most of them reflect the personal attitude of the writers rather than carefully executed research. An attempt has been made to eliminate the purely exhortative articles even though some of them have very sound, if undocumented, conceptualizations of educational issues.

The review covered a period of about fifteen years. It is presented herewith in the briefest form merely to suggest some of the ways in which the issues and problems of educational administration have previously been identified in the literature. It is selective rather than exhaustive, and it incorporates primarily periodical and fugitive materials.

Educational Change

Societal and Community Changes

Little appears to have been written about the cultural problems facing school superintendents prior to 1965. That there appears to be a dearth of literature in the field of educational administration is significant since the fields of sociology and anthropology have accumulated a large amount of research which apparently was not extensively used to stimulate further research or developments in the field of educational administration.

Campbell (14) asserted that the larger society has tried to shape the schools by imposing its traditions and values upon the schools, by controlling the resources made available to the schools, and by establishing the procedures and structures for the governance of the schools. Other forces tend to operate informally so as to keep the schools responsive to the needs and changes within the broader society. These forces tend to mediate between the internal stablizing factors within the school system and the outside influences which produce needs for adaptability. Not the least of the problems now encountered in the schools arise from a shift in emphasis from the local school district as the final judge and arbiter of the educational program to a concern for the involvement of the state and federal levels both in the stimulation of new programs and in the establishment of new directions and educational goals.

Ashby (2) maintained that although Americans favor local initiative and control by tradition, the tide of affairs is moving in a contrary direction. He listed a variety of "nationalizing influences" including federal aid to education, national testing programs, national professional associations, national lay associations interested in education, major foundations, the Conant reports, voluntary regional accrediting associations, United States Office of Education, and national hysteria over the role of the school in the current world situation.

Lieberman (84) held that the centralization of education is both desirable and inevitable and that the greatest barrier to a centralized educational system is the fear that centralized control will provide an opportunity for a pressure group to seize control of the schools and maintain itself in power through the control of education. Lieberman maintained that a centralized educational system as such is no more likely than our present organization to be controlled for the selfish ends of a particular group. He cited as evidence the centralization of education in England, France, and the Scandanavian Countries where national systems of education result in less interference with the autonomy of teachers than in the United States.

Lieberman also held that a profession is an occupation which requires the exercise of technical skills and the application of specialized knowledge not available to the general public. It is in the public interest to accord professional autonomy to the professional worker so that he can make decisions that call upon his expertness. Lieberman felt that the traditional system of local control has resulted in the imposition of restrictions upon the free exercise of professional knowledge and judgment in deference to local community wishes, traditions, and pressures. Centralization itself will hasten the establishment of professional

autonomy. This view is supported by Havighurst (59), as well, who forecast that sooner or later the public will realize that there is no alternative but to accept both centralized control and professional autonomy in the operation of the schools.

Gilchrist (53) studied the effects of population mobility upon the changing cultural influences upon the schools. He found that when middle and high income people from the cities migrate in large numbers to the suburbs they are replaced by migrants from rural areas who have lower educational and occupational skills. Characteristically, the schools have been slow to make the adaptations necessary to this situation.

Davis (25) noted that big cities may no longer be able to solve their problems on their own. Federal intervention to provide the resources and assistance necessary may be their only salvation.

Federal Influences

As might be expected, there is considerable disagreement among writers with regard to federal aid to education. Sperber (116) specified that federal control exists only when federal aid is distributed in such a manner as to modify the nature and content of the educational program. His survey of the attitudes of school officials about federal aid showed that they do not fear federal control if there are adequate safeguards written into federal legislation.

Lieberman (83), on the other hand, advocated the intervention of the federal government as a means for the improvement and extension of of the educational program particularly as a result of the default of the local school district to provide the resources and special educational programs required. He called upon the federal government to control education in small school districts, in particular, which do not have the personnel and resources necessary to maintain the educational programs and

services required. Lieberman asserted (84) that national educational needs are such that it will be imperative for local control over the curriculum to be terminated in the near future. He maintained that eventually authority over the curriculum will be lodged with national professional agencies.

The United States News (122) reported that the federal dollar is proving a powerful weapon to force an end to segregated schools. It was reported that legislation restricting the distribution of federal money to school districts which maintain segregated schools produced a rush toward desegregation in the South. It was concluded that this factor has resulted in a greater movement toward desegregation than any one thing since the United States Supreme Court ruling of 1954.

Reporting on a study of teacher satisfaction in slum schools, Wayson (126) identified a significant number of ways in which the federal government through its new programs of intervention is helping to improve local education. Wayson notes, however, that if adequate definitions of the responsibilities of educational agencies on various levels are not met, the situation can result in power struggles between contending giants, each of which will act as a check and balance against each other rather than a meshing of efforts and resources to improve the quality of education.

Campbel et al (15) noted that although there is considerable confusion at the present time, the American system was one of national federalism from the beginning. They viewed the present trends as a resurgence of national federalism resulting in the need for the development of a new policy for the sharing of decision-making among national, state, and local educational authorities.

Exton (42) noted that while administrators opposed categorical federal aid, they were also quite ready to accept it. She also noted the

extent to which national assessment programs are encouraging the nationalization of the schools while industry is encouraging categorical aid because it will be able to sell more equipment to the schools as a result of the specialized, technical assistance that is rendered. Exton (43) noted that federal legislation established programs and educational goals and resulted in the attrition of the power and authority of the local school district.

Representing the industrial point of view in contrast to Exton's assertions, The Nation's Business (44) suggested that the growing democratization of federal aid has resulted in massive federal intervention. Many negative effects upon the university were discussed, including the de-emphasis of good teaching. The end effect, according to the author, could be the nationalization of the campus.

Cunningham (23) raised the issue of the constitutionality of federal programs. He indicated that state governments are being bypassed and their own authority over education curtailed.

According to a survey conducted by The Nation's Schools (129) in which 16,000 school administrators were sampled, 36 percent of the respondents said that federal controls over local school policy outweigh the advantages of federal aid to education, while 63 percent said they did not. Sixty-one percent of the respondents indicated that the major educational problems that confronted their school districts could have been resolved without federal funds. Forty-eight percent said that the danger of federal interference in local school administration is of prime importance. Thirty-seven percent said that the issue is more emotional than real; eleven percent indicated that there was no cause for concern; and four percent made random comments. The most frequent complaints of administrators were that federal aid required too much paper work but that

federal controls resulted in more good than harm to the public schools. Other criticisms expressed by administrators in this study included: (1) the best story writer gets his projects accepted; (2) big districts stand to gain the most from federal aid because any federal funds received by smaller districts will be gobbled up by the bookkeeping and report filing; and (3) fear that the U. S. Office of Education was obtaining too much power.

Stumps (118) noted that the extension of federal aid necessitates that school districts create new administrative positions staffed by individuals who are skillful in preparing and negotiating proposals for grants from federal and other agencies.

Ianni and McNeill (71) expressed high hopes for the values to education resulting from the regional educational laboratories, particularly in their role as disseminators of educational research. They indicated that a key role for the laboratories will be the conversion of new ideas emerging from research into forms usable in the public school classrooms. Campbell and Sroufe (15) felt that the emerging role of the federal government in education should result in the federal government's assuming responsibilities for the reform of teacher education. They indicated that federal programs can be improved through more effective coordination of the various federal agencies involved in educational programs. Chase (17) noted a need for more effective programs for financing schools in urban renewal areas and a federal agency to disseminate available information regarding the planning of school facilities.

State Influences

Relatively few articles were found over a fifteen year period that discussed the influences of the state in stimulating educational change.

Campbell and Sroufe (15) stated that the state should retain its plenary powers over education and should utilize its powers in the improvement of educational programs. They concluded that federal intervention has resulted from the failure of the state to perform its necessary role.

The Nation's Schools (129) reported that school men agreed that, "It's not the federal government which has school men gnashing their teeth--it's their own state departments of education."

Community Influences

Gross (57) conducted long-range telephone interviews with twenty randomly selected school superintendents from the population of school districts with 100,000 or more enrollment. He asked particularly, "Who is applying what prssures to the schools?" He found that the single greatest community demand upon superintendents was to "hold the line" on school costs. Eighty-five percent of the city superintendents and 55 percent of the surburban superintendents reported heavy pressures on finances. Such groups as taxpayers associations and local chambers of commerce exerted pressure upon the schools. In contrast to these pressures, Gross found that there is constantly greater pressure from within the school for augmenting school expenditures. He noted that teachers were pressuring for higher salaries and more fringe benefits while parents were demanding increased operating funds for improved school programs. The second general area of pressure most frequently mentioned related to curriculum change. Eighty-five percent of the city superintendents reported pressures for the commitment of larger resources to special programs for the academically talented and the intellectually or culturally handicapped. Another demand upon the superintendents was that there be greater stress on the solid academic subjects, especially mathematics,

physical sciences, and the teaching of foreign languages. Superintendents noted greater pressures from parents for the preparation of their children for admission to colleges and universities of their choice. Eighty-five percent of the suburban superintendents and thirty percent of the city superintendents indicated that this was becoming one of the most difficult pressures with which they had to deal. Other preliminary findings included: (1) concern over the decreasing enrollments in the central city; (2) growing concern for college entrance resulting in increased parental pressures for children to devote more time to their studies and resulting in anxiety among students having limited intellectual abilities; (3) greater coverage of educational news by the press; (4) more home work, higher standards and greater proportion of student failures; (5) a tide of negative criticism against the public schools stimulated by Conant's early articles; (6) growing interest and concern about public education has resulted in much greater effort by the schools to communicate with the public about needs and problems.

As previously indicated, there is considerable debate over the issue of continuing local control of education. Campbell and Sroufe (15) maintained that it is desirable that local control over public schools be maintained. They prefer an effective partnership among local, state, and national educational agencies with each partner equally strong so that no one level will be able to dominate the others. Morely (92), writing in The Nation's Business, indicated that the primary issue was not sources of funds but control over the educational program.

An editorial in The New Republic (103) suggested that there is a possibility that the main trouble with American education may not be the scarcity of finances as much as inept control. It asserted that the

American school is run by local business men, politicians, and housewives who "imagine that the highest purpose of education is to produce alumni like themselves." The editorial favored a system of local control that is less capricious. Lieberman (82) advocated restrictions upon local control. This view was shared by Wilson (134 and 135) who stated that we may be approaching the end of the line in our system of local control since it is cumbersome, slow, limited, and cannot meet the educational needs of a dynamically changing society. He maintained that it is a wasteful system which we can no longer afford. Gideonese was quoted in the New York Times (52) to the effect that the local autonomy of thousands of small school boards is the greatest weakness in American education.

Nugent (95) maintained that local educational leaders have not exerted the quality of leadership which is needed in the schools and have demonstrated their lack of understanding of the political activity necessary to maintain the operations of the public schools. Local effectiveness has declined as a result of the lack of leadership, necessitating state and federal agencies to step in to fill the vacuums that were created. Nugent suggested that local school boards may be nearing political obsolescence because their failure to exercise dynamic leadership has resulted in the emphasis upon federal leadership. He maintained that unless school boards find ways to become informed about the processes of political decision making and the ways in which the educational program can be improved to meet current social needs, they will become "as necessary as the human appendix appears to be."

Wilson (134) noted that pressure groups have become an important community influence upon educational change. He defined a pressure group as "any significant body of people organized or unorganized with a

specific objective to achieve within the schools." He asserted that pressure groups insure that the majority view may not always prevail in school policies.

Wilde (132) noted five pressure groups which attempt to influence school policies: religious organizations, commercial interests, private individuals, political organizations, and social organizations. He agreed with Wilson that board members themselves represent the most influential pressure force within the community.

Examples were given by various authors to demonstrate the effect of certain pressure groups. Hechinger (67) pointed out that the independence of the big city school system is a myth. The budgetary planning authorities of the city hold decisive behind-the-scenes power. Not only can the planning commission take money away from the board's budget, but it can also determine the pace at which schools are built. Chase (17) pointed out that pressures of vested interest groups encourage and force schools to acquire sites that are unsuitable in size, location, or accessibility.

An article in the Christian Century (110) revealed that a group in Indianapolis called the Citizens' School Committee selected members of the school board for over thirty years. This group was cited to demonstrate the fact that responsible citizens' groups may generate into tight status-conscious school cliques which consider the school board their private preserve and which concentrate on self-perpetuation at the expense of public education.

Radical groups appear to be of particular concern to writers on educational measures. Such groups are defined as small collections of persons more interested in attacking the schools than in helping them (109). These groups are frequently labeled as "fanatics." Although it is

maintained that criticism is a part of the American educational tradition, the "right wingers" may become so extreme as to become confused with the Communists or the Facists (24). Davis (24) pointed out that their messages deal in destructive remarks, personalities, misrepresentations, generalities, distortions, sensationalism, innuendos, and so forth. These groups make inroads through textbook censorship, election of extremists to school boards, and seizing the control of PTA's. According to Rice (105), although the membership in the John Birch Society is estimated as only 75,000, its power and influence has spread through twelve other ultra rightist organizations. Davis (24) identified 3,000 such groups and indicated that a coalition of about 100 such groups claims as many as 3,000,000 members. The Nation (102) indicated that the radical right has mounted a concerted drive to persuade and/or force the American school "to teach its prejudiced beliefs and its right wing version of history." It indicated that there has been intense pressures on teachers and textbooks at the local level. Scharer et al (109) reported on how a district can determine when it is going to be attacked by observing the surrounding districts, watching letters to the editor in the school paper, and observing the type of speakers brought into the community by such groups.

Davis (24) listed a number of techniques that can be used to combat successfully the influences of extremist groups upon the public schools. Rice (109) held that a school district can defend itself best by establishing policies for handling controversial matters, having a strong board that is willing to back up its administration and teachers in times of attack and is knowledgeable of the tactics and objectives of extremist pressure groups.

Other statements of community problems which influence educational change included problems and issues which arise as a result of rapid population growth (54), recruiting and retaining high calibre leaders on the school boards (2), achieving needed reorganization of school districts (12), and cooperation among officials of all urban planning groups (17).

Organizing for Change

Although there is considerable research and conceptual literature in the behavioral sciences related to the introduction of innovations into organizations, in the period covered by this survey there was basically no research reported in the field of educational administration and only a small amount of conceptual literature. Most of the literature was the traditional type of educational article which appears for administrators and teachers.

Stumps (118) identified the need for change as one of the most important problems confronting school administrators. He suggested that practically the entire educational enterprise needs to be brought up to date through changes and refinements in its basic organizational patterns and programs.

Ashby (2) suggested that experimental and research programs carried on by school districts must be carefully evaluated, and a percentage of the local budget should be devoted annually to projects of this type. Kowitz (80) emphasized the importance of planning for the introduction of innovations into school systems. He pointed out that progress comes in two forms, both through evolution and through revolution. Revolution occurs only as the indirect result of growing dissatisfaction and frequently destroys old standards and methods which may not then be

reasonably replaced until much later. Orderly maintenance of educational programs necessitates, according to him, careful planning of educational changes.

Willower (133) discussed the kinds of resistance to changes which are likely to occur in school systems. These include the real or perceived threat that change poses to status, reaction to changes imposed from above, lack of information or skill, and economic problems. He indicated that resistance may be demonstrated in forms that run from verbal hostility to organizational sabotage. He concluded that the educational administrator who wishes to provide for productive change and innovation should promote the open organizational climate.

Ianni (71) supported Willower's contention. He stated that the involvement of teachers in the process of innovation is essential for the success of experiments and should accompany the development of new materials and techniques. He also pointed out that the educational system needs to revise its organizational structure specifically to enable it to identify points of obsolescence and to plan for procedures which are most effective for the introduction of innovations. McCarty (88) indicated that change is likely to be achieved in the educational enterprise only if the administrator cultivates cooperative decision-making processes. He described the innovating process as one which requires immense courage and security on the part of the innovator.

Negotiations--Teacher Militancy

Since 1960, an increasing amount of concern has been expressed in the literature relative to administrative problems arising from the new teacher militancy. Schooling (111) pointed out that although there is disagreement about the consequences and forces involved in the changing relationships

between classroom teachers and administrators, few members of the profession are unaware of these forces and of the confusion and frustration they are producing. Organized teachers are selecting their own spokesmen, their own officers, their own committees, and are asking their committees to represent them in direct negotiations with the board--frequently sidestepping the superintendent.

Stumps (118) suggested that as a result of these pressures, administrators are being forced into the same uncomfortable role as the managerial groups of industry--a management vs. worker contest. This raises an unpleasant situation because (1) although the administrator has traditionally looked upon himself as the agent for protecting the teachers, they now reject him; (2) he and the administrative hierarchy lack the temperament and skills needed by negotiators; and (3) he feels that his authority is being challenged inappropriately and unwisely.

Rice (107) noted that some teacher groups were seeking legislation which would allow them to bypass the board of education if an impasse developed in their negotiations with that board. Increasingly, teachers and their organizations were seeking and obtaining a role in the formulation of major policies, especially on personnel matters which affect the quality of teaching. Hechinger (62) reported growing resistance of teachers to classroom supervision by principals and supervisors and their efforts for instituting teaching improvements.

Schooling (111) maintained that today's teacher is better prepared, more sophisticated, and more aware of the issues confronting education than his counterpart of former years. He stated that teachers have observed the results of aggressive collective action on the part of labor, business, and other professional groups. These are factors which make the

teacher bolder in his demands than he might otherwise be. The societal pressures on education also lead teachers to be more interested in achieving their goals rapidly.

Lieberman (85) argued that the absence of a strong teachers' organization underlies every major educational problem of our time. He maintained that strong teachers' associations which exclude administrators are essential to the public interest. Administrators in the past have dominated teachers' organizations and prevented their becoming effective instruments for expressing teacher demands. He stated that the NEA Code of Ethics is a collection of platitudes which is completely ignored by most educators. Since education associations are dominated by administrators, professionalism in education has come to be identified with acquiescence to administrative direction or public opinion.

Schooling (111) identified several ways in which administrators are reacting to changing relationships with teachers. School administrators indicated to him that they resent having to spend so much time on personnel problems that they cannot concentrate on other areas of concern. They may also feel that when a solid front is needed in education, internal strife is detrimental to the field. Rice (107) suggested there is a natural inclination by today's administrator to resist the forces that alter a relationship that is both familiar and comfortable to him. He feared that there is real danger of policy control over the schools passing from administrators and school boards to militant teacher organizations and their officials.

Garber (49) reported that the behavior of the superintendent in teacher negotiations with the board is an undefined area of school administration. When the superintendent becomes the negotiator for the board, he puts

himself in a difficult position. A superintendent can't oppose teachers on certain matters and be recognized as their leader on others. In addition, when the superintendent becomes the negotiator, he may leave a leadership vacuum in his system which destroys centralized authority. Donovan (31) pointed out that administrators are faced with a number of new problems which have to be resolved once they are involved in collective negotiations. These include drawing a distinction between working conditions and matters of educational policy, recognizing areas of responsibility between teachers and supervisors, and delineating the range of the teacher's responsibilities beyond the normal requirements of the classroom. He, too, emphasized that administrators are finding the negotiations process to be extremely time consuming.

Donovan also pointed out that for the first time administrators are faced with the need for developing effective grievance procedures and for being prepared to deal with arbitration procedures and actual strikes.

Garber (49) suggested that the situation demands a degree of specialization which administrators do not have, and, consequently, school districts will need to consider whether or not they should employ a personnel director who can serve as a negotiator or if they need at least a part time professionally trained negotiator to represent the board. Smaller school districts may not be able to bear the burden of such costs, and school board associations might employ such personnel and loan their services to school districts at minimum costs.

Hechinger (62), among others, expressed the opinion that the present situation can be resolved only through the recruitment of superior persons into education, and administrators must be appointed who can command the respect of teachers.

Instruction

Brownell (9) indicated that the instructional concerns of administrators include: (1) identifying good teachers; (2) acquiring outstanding teachers; (3) obtaining maximum performance from teachers and students; (4) making the subject matter more interesting to students regardless of its nature, arrangement, or manner of teaching; and (5) motivating individuals.

Teacher satisfaction also concerns administrators in light of the number of teachers leaving the profession each year. Dunn (33) attempted to identify the factors which influenced teachers to leave the profession. He found that poor retirement benefits, tenure provisions, and financial problems were considered most influential. In order to find solutions to these problems, Brownell (9) suggested that administrators: (1) analyze the problems which reoccur and tap the reservoir of intelligence among the members of the faculty; (2) resist the unhealthy desire to sell and engineer and report honestly the data, letting good programs and bad speak for themselves, for only an honestly informed public can rationally exercise its power to aid the schools; (3) ascertain exactly what their school is doing now as a reflection of what it ought to be doing; (4) examine his own attitudes as well as his policies. The only excuse for school administration is the facilitation of instruction.

Feverish arranging and rearranging of the curriculum has failed to solve perennial problems facing educators. Wilson (135) pointed out that a fantastic amount of time and study has gone into curriculum development over the past half century. However, he found that the curriculum in both elementary and secondary levels is still pretty much the same as it was thirty or forty years ago.

The introduction of non-human teaching devices has raised questions as to their value and appropriateness. Stumps (118) claimed that educational technology is not synonymous with educational gadgetry. The problem is to determine how mechanical devices will serve the needs of the instructional program.

Many administrators are limited in their freedom to develop a curriculum suited to the needs and desires of a local school district. Garber and Boyer (50) found that in most states, the legislature has the first and final say about what the schools will teach. Limitations have been placed upon such things as instruction in birth control, the use of textbooks that teach the theories of evolution, or the teaching of any theory that denies the divine creation of man. In one state, pupils cannot be compelled to follow any prescribed course of study. In another state the court ruled that, "The power of each parent to decide what studies the scholar should pursue would be a power of discouraging the school and rendering it substantially useless." Legislatures not only have the power to say what should be taught, but how it is taught. However, most courts agreed that school officials have authority to determine methods. One court went so far as to rule board members not qualified to determine teaching methods.

A balance must be maintained between quality and quantity in education. Just meeting the needs of educating the increasing quantities of children is not enough. Ianni and McNeill (71) emphasized that educators will increasingly have to answer the question, "What shall we teach and to what end?" There is considerable confusion as to who has the right answers to the questions regarding new programs.

In other areas of national concern, one turns to the scientist through research and development. In education, however, research and development is still in its infancy. Educational research has had little far-reaching effects on the schools because, according to Ianni and McNeill (71), "Neither the efforts to innovate nor the arrangement for diffusing innovation has been developed on a scale that even approaches the need."

Lieberman (83) proposed that the content of the public schools is important enough to justify a permanent research and evaluation program under the guidance of leading scholars. Kowitz (80) found some evidence of movement in this direction as increasing financial support has been given to research and experimentation. After a survey of the Chicago schools in 1964, Havighurst (59) recommended to the Board of Education that approximately one percent of the annual budget be allocated for research and development. He also recommended that a Division of Research and Development be established within the school system and that the school contract with a local university for the conduct of research and the training of research personnel for work in the schools.

Kowitz (80) expressed concern for future educational practices as he indicated that school operators have demonstrated considerable inability to project improved practices from the present methodologies: "Current educational theory seems to be at its limits."

Davis (25) discovered little progress in finding solutions to problems of educating the slum child, of staffing, of replacing new schools for old, and of financing. Educators become so busy pointing out the cancer in the central areas that they tend to overlook the fact that the whole system is sick.

In-Service Education for Administrators

Beech and Radliff (4) proposed that the most important single thing a school district could do to improve its school would be to permit or, if necessary, require its administrators to engage in well-planned programs of in-service education. Like the physician and the scientist, the administrator must spend an increasing proportion of his time in keeping abreast of developments in his field. His pre-service education, however extensive and thorough it might have been, provided only the foundation for his career. For the structure itself he needs the supporting framework which only in-service education can provide. Changes are taking place so rapidly that the administrator who wishes to keep up to date cannot depend on chance or informal arrangements. He must seek the best possible means of continuing his education.

Among the hundreds of in-service offerings by different institutions and agencies, there is a lack in broad design and a lack in coordination and planning. The administrator is forced to pick and choose, and he soon finds duplication of effort, lack of continuity, and sometimes even conflict of interest among the agencies and institutions, each of which--ironically enough--is attempting in its own way to help make him a better administrator. He ends up, in effect, finding no in-service program at all, only in-service activities.

Considerable emphasis was placed upon the need for a major overhaul in the current ideas about in-service programs for administrators during the 1963 convention of the AASA. A strong plea was made for coordination of effort for long-range planning and for broadening the goals of in-service education--goals which cannot be accomplished without a strong professional commitment to them.

Cunningham (23) suggested that educators might take a tip from the medical societies. In in-service training, medical groups devote considerable time to hearing papers presented by their members. These papers are carefully prepared and are subjected to the professional criticism of their colleagues. This approach could be adopted by school systems and professional organizations, and may be more effective than what presently passes for in-service training.

Carol (16) proposed that opportunities be provided for continuing education in the form of workshops, intervisitation, clinics, and individual guidance from specialists. Johnston (74) suggested a regional approach to solving educational problems by use of two-way electronic communication systems which can bring the services of far away experts into push-button contact with educators in the field. He also suggested the development of regional centers for training people in technical skills. The development of automated record-keeping has provided the opportunity for more time to be spent by teachers in teaching and administrators in thought. However, Stumps (118) noted that since machinery does only what it is told, administrators must learn how to give complicated orders to intricate machinery. Without these technical skills, there will be less time for teaching and less administrative thought. In-service work in this area may result in improved instructional programs and administrative leadership.

Hencley (69) suggested that the administrator's world is largely verbal, and that sensitivity to others and verbal communications are important requisites to success. The superintendent's effectiveness and efficiency are determined by his ability to: (1) perceive clearly and accurately; (2) communicate effectively; (3) evaluate value patterns and

motivating forces; (4) unify and harmonize the expectations of major reference groups; (5) work skillfully with groups; (6) make wise decisions on the basis of experimental background in the context of power. Training and in-service programs need to be developed more extensively in these areas.

Administrative Leadership

Quality

Griffiths (56) indicated that school administration is in a period of redirection which was instigated largely by the Kellogg Foundation and the project which grew from it, called the Cooperative Program in Educational Administration. "The new directions now apparent in school administration stem from: (1) the emergence of new problems, (2) the development of new theories, and (3) the creation of new methods of instruction." Sparks (115) found that the national trend is toward better qualified superintendents. Typical superintendents today have considerable work beyond the master's degree, and many have completed six or seven years of preparation. However, administrators are expressing their concern regarding their lack of skill in solving the problems which they presently face.

According to Moffitt (91), many school administrators will reluctantly admit that their pre-service training did not even remotely prepare them for the rigorous reality and vicissitudes demanded by the job. Many of the most important elements were virtually ignored:

> There is no course in dog-removal, which is the daily duty of every superintendent outside of New York and Chicago. Little instruction is given in such opulent subjects as relationship with Mrs. Busty. The care and feeding of school boards is hastily passed over, as is emergency bus repair and driving. Actually, the study of judo would be more practical than training in such things as football, inasmuch as the daily encounters of the superintendents are largely with indivuals, and he is at their mercy when his skills in hypnotism fail.

Ryan (108) found that a large portion of the superintendent's time was spent in handling day-to-day problems. However, little or no pre-service training was received in dealing with these problems. He proposed that the pre-service program should acquaint the prospective administrator with the major problems that may arise and instruct him in the use of various effective directives and techniques for their solutions.

Sparks (115) found that superintendents in Alabama desired that greater emphasis should be placed upon school plant, school law, school finance, and business administration in their preparation program. He recommended that courses in public relations, business administration, and public speaking should be offered outside the college of education. He also considered that an intern experience would be valuable.

According to Cunningham (23) it is not unusual for the administrator in the field to be skeptical about theory in education. Part of this is due to bad theory and part to his sense of what is practical. Griffiths (56) expressed the view that traditional administrative theory has failed to meet the challenge of contemporary educational problems. What is needed is a theory which interprets how people behave in an educational organization and the manner in which administrators can cope with this behavior. He stated that the emphasis is away from boards, buildings and buses and toward the behavior of people.

Howe (70) suggested a note of caution as the new programs for the training of administrators could over-emphasize credits in education and limit experiences in the liberal arts. Administrators have a need for a broad education in the humanities and sciences to develop the vision which can transform them from educational managers to educational leaders.

A number of writers expressed their concern regarding the lack of forceful leadership on the part of administrators. Keppel (61) indicated that education reacts to the pressures of society after a crisis becomes acute, rather than taking the initiative to avert crises. The leadership fails to grasp the seriousness and the immediacy of the situation. Hechinger (61) stated that there are many examples where educational leaders have not functioned as leaders in identifying issues before they were forced to by the public. School reforms in science came about only after the Soviet launching of their satellite. Even the fight against school dropouts originated in the office of President Kennedy rather than in state or local school boards. The point is made succinctly, "There are two ways to get to the top of an oak tree: Climb it, or sit on an acorn." It seems that the conventional administrator has chosen to sit rather than climb. Fusco (48), expressing a similar view, stated that standards will be raised for training and selection, for performance and growth, only because of society's demands.

Boortz (8) studied the costs of educating public school administrators compared to the costs of educating lawyers, dentists, and doctors. He found that expenditures for educating school administrators were lowest and far below those for dentists and physicians. The highest administration student cost was lower than the lowest medical student cost reported throughout the United States. He indicated that society would be justified in increasing its investment in potential superintendents wherever such increase gives promise of a better prepared individual.

From a study of the characteristics of successful school administrators, Wright (138) found that:

(1) They come from a simple, hardworking, religious family in which education is considered important.

(2) High scholastic achievement in public school and college is an important factor. The choice of undergraduate major and minor is immaterial.

(3) Teaching experience is essential. The city superintendency is a fundamental proving ground, and the most important single technique to insure success as a superintendent is the development of community participation in school affairs.

(4) The administrator must be able to work harmoniously with people.

Brownell (9) added that the healthy school administrator considers people more important than organizational schemes, sees administration as a function, not the function, in the process of learning, and wields power as a means of facilitating instruction and not an end in itself.

Looking ahead, Rice (104) forecast three basic needs for the public school administrator of the near future. He must be able to act as a coordinator of specialists as districts become larger; he must assemble more research data as background for program improvement and in order to work professionally with his board; and he must have greater job security. In accord with these needs, Ashby (2) indicated that the administrator must read widely, experiment carefully, welcome promising innovations, and become something of an educational statesman. The new generation of administrators must be better people and better trained to deal with the tasks ahead.

Talbot (119) expressed deep concern about the high casualty rate of school superintendents. Of six leading superintendents who had met at Baltimore for a conference, not one still held the same job two years later. All had been fired, transferred to other cities, or quit the profession. He concluded that administrative preparation programs are producing graduates ill-prepared or unsuited to survive the guerilla

warfare of public service in the cities. Possibly education should look to business, law, labor or public service for competent people.

In a study of the turnover of Missouri superintendents, Morton (93) found that inadequate salary was the most significant factor with tenure policies, community pressures, and administrative pressures as the next three most contributing factors.

Cunningham (23) surveyed the broad changes taking place in the preparation and training of administrators. In this study he recommended that UCEA assist in the continued improvement of the pre-service and in-service education, stimulate research through cooperation among institutions, and facilitate dissemination of research findings and communicate descriptions of good practices throughout the profession.

Pounds (99) studied school administration in terms of size of district and the years of experience of the administrator. He found that district size affects the kinds of problems perceived by superintendents and their frequency of occurrence, but has little effect upon the perception of the difficulty of problems. The length of the superintendent's experience does not affect the perception of difficulty or frequency of administrators' problems.

Political Involvement

Donaldson (30) stated that if public education is to improve and the profession of education be significantly advanced, it is imperative that all educators and their associations become politically active. Gregg (55) indicated that the public nature of education insures that it is a political realm, and its administrators are politicians in the sense that they cannot escape being engaged in the political process. This process is mostly nonpartisan, but at times will take on partisan characteristics. Wilson (136)

argued that as long as public education receives its greatest financial support by direct vote of the public, as long as the major control lies in the hands of popularly elected officials, as long as all children are compelled to attend school, skilled political leadership will be required of the school executive.

Gregg (55) urged that administrators recognize the political nature of their jobs and work continuously to develop the knowledge and skills necessary to function effectively in the political process. He must learn about personalities, organizations and other power agents operating in the school district which influence educational decisions. Not only must the administrator know about the power structure, but be able to make effective use of it. Van Dorn (123) supported this viewpoint and indicated that no community service can or should be immune from political processes.

Donaldson (30) recommended that the superintendent exercise caution in his political activity. The administrator, in theory, should have equal rights in expressing his political views, as long as he acts as an individual. However, it is practically impossible to divorce the individual from his position. The superintendent must think his position through carefully in order that he not proceed in such a way that his effectiveness as an educational leader be diminished.

Cleary (18) found that the majority of educators have attempted to steer clear of political involvement and ignore the fact that public education is almost completely dependent upon the government for its financing. It is becoming increasingly apparent that local governments can no longer support the public schools. However, political conservatives are fighting to halt what they consider unwarranted intrusions of the federal government into local problems, and political liberals are actively

promoting the expansion of federal power. This struggle has submerged the questions of how to provide the best education for the youth of America and who is to provide the leadership and direction. He concluded that the lack of political skill has resulted in a loss of influence by administrators on educational issues.

Talbot (119) proposed the recruiting and hiring of a new kind of school superintendent who would be able to demand a very different type of collaboration from city political leaders than has been practiced. Men are needed who would insist, for example, that mayors help their schools. Mayors frequently have been roadblocks to the schools, and superintendents have taken the blame for the sorry state of the local educational system.

Board-Superintendent Relations

Considerable attention has recently been given to a problem that has plagued school administrators for a long time: How to persuade able citizens to serve on the school board? The controversial issues which have encompassed the schools and the time obligation have contributed to this problem. Hechinger (64) asserted that in cities such as New York demands on the time of unpaid board members have become exorbitant. A board president must spend almost full time at his position while sacrificing his personal life and his private profession or occupation.

In numerous communities across the country, school board elections are dominated by bitter campaigns aimed at forcing specific changes in school programs. According to Fisher (46), if the school is to remain useful and responsive to any group or pressure, considerably more attention must be given to strengthening the school as an institution and to safeguarding the integrity of the school system as an enterprise serving the whole community. "School board members that come with axes to grind are

rarely the builders of better institutions." The Nation's Schools (100) editorialized that one of the most important functions of the school board of the future will be to resist unreasonable and impossible demands made upon the schools by pressure groups. Fisher (46) argued that the proper contribution of the school board member is "Not expertise but wisdom; not detailed knowledge, but high values and sound judgment."

Several writers demonstrated concern about the procedure of selecting board members. Hechinger (60) raised the question of whether school boards should be appointed or elected. Van Dorn (123) recommended that in a truly integrated system the mayor of the community should appoint school board members subject to confirmation by the city council. Regardless of the method of selection, the basic objectives of the board should be "...the coordination of the educational government."

Many problems facing administrators stem from the arbitrary or incongruous delineation of responsibilities among the board and administration. Separating policy from administration on the part of the board presents problems in some districts. Hechiner (66) argued that under existing laws in New York, school boards are responsible for details of administration, which are actually matters that belong to the superintendent. He further concluded (64) that a major reason for conflict in school administration lay in the failure of boards to "keep their hands off the schools' administration." The fault lies not only with the board but also with the superintendent's inability or unwillingness to assume responsibility. Administrators too often lack the courage and decisiveness to run the show.

In contrasts to Hechinger's views, Wilson (135) argued that administrators have been too eager to assume responsibilities that probably belong

to the board. "Too frequently the tribute of courage is applied to the man who stands up to his board of education and demands his own way." The function of decision making is a board responsibility. The superintendent's job is to bring all the pertinent facts and arguments to the board and help them make a decision.

According to Keeler (76) there is a definite pattern of friction between school boards and administrators, which seems to be brought about by the inevitable ambiguity of human conditions, the power struggle involving prestige and motive, the varying location of roles and the discrepancy between theory and practice.

Kerr (77) found that school board politics has considerable effect upon the role behavior of board members because of the relative absence of clear-cut constituencies and the candidates' lack of familiarity with board activities and the educational program.

A dangerous practice which is prevalent among many school boards is the creation of standing committees. Hechinger (64) cautioned that the existence of such committees invites the professional staff to abdicate its responsibilities and encourages the public to bring issues directly to the board.

Role of the Superintendent

The concept of administration has recently experienced considerable refinement, which is reflected in practices of government, industry, religion, and education. No longer can administration be regarded as simply policy execution. Shafer (114) considered administration to be a service function dealing with the formulation of major goals, purposes, and policies of the enterprise as well as the execution of those which are ultimately determined by the representative body. Rice (106) stated that there is

definitely a new image of the school superintendent as a professional servant and leader, and yet the job is one of the most frustrating and hazardous occupations in public life. He suggested that many capable superintendents have walked the plank or decided to play it safe, because school board members have interpreted the board's role and functions as different from what the superintendent was taught to believe.

Koch (79) studied the problems facing superintendents in Pennsylvania to determine the nature of their official duties. He found seven major general duties were recognized by the superintendents: (1) curriculum development, (2) public relations, (3) personnel management, (4) working with the board, (5) pupil accounting, (6) supervision of pupil activity program, and (7) management of school property. Superintendents were faced with similar problems and duties regardless of their degrees of experience or the type of district in which they functioned.

Hechinger (67) raised some fundamental questions regarding the role of the superintendent and the present administrative structure. Is the job of the big city superintendency an impossible one? Is the concept of local school control obsolete? Are conflicts between lay school boards and chief administrators inevitable and beyond hope of settlement?

Campbell (13) listed four major reference groups with which the administrator must deal: the school community, the board, the school organization, and the organized profession. In dealing with the school community the administrator faces a vast array of publics, one being the school board which may or may not be representative of the community. Within the school organization he is confronted with a series of relationships conceptualized by Jensen (73A) as the formal work structure, authority structure, communication structure, and cliques. Considering the organized

profession, Van Duyn (123A) found that meetings of superintendents in Michigan seemed to deal little with the real problems which confront educators.

Halpin (57A) found that staff members and school board members lacked agreement in the leadership behavior of their superintendent. Goldhammer (53A) indicated that school board members often speak for the community power structure and are not necessarily speaking for other segments of the community.

In addition to the conflict among major groups, the superintendent faces conflict within the groups. Among teacher groups there is disagreement as to the role of the administrator and the social relationships which ought to exist between administrator and staff. McCarty (88) saw the administrator as a stimulator of goal-achieving behavior on the part of the staff through the cultivation of cooperative decision-making practices and recognizing the interdependent relationships which exist between teachers.

From an examination of the administrator's role, Miller (90) identified four types of leadership: inclusive, exclusive, standardized, and integrative. The inclusive type prevails where any or all of the responsibilities of administration are included and the administrator is a specialist of things in general. Exclusive emphasizes school teaching and separates administration from policy-making. The administrator becomes a 'managerial chore boy' for the public. The standardized type implies that what a school is, and what education is, must be standardized apart from the community. This type is directed mostly to beginning administrators, and it tells them how to get started and leaves further development to their own experience. The integrative type identifies the administrator as a specialist who integrates and stimulates educators within the institution and with the supporting community.

Griffiths (38) stated that administration is concerned with controlling the way in which people behave within an organization through the use of power. For some time domination has been an acceptable means of control. However, as teachers have become better prepared, as teacher organizations have become stronger, and as the shortage of teachers has become acute, administrators are less able to use this method. Manipulation is replacing direct methods and the conventional line-and-staff operation is being questioned. A new role for the American school administrator is emerging. He must be a leader "... not only in the field of education but also in shaping the cultural and social development of our time." This presents a tremendous challenge for school administrators and raises a pertinent question which is posed by Hechinger (67) as to whether a new breed of administrators can be found who can be powers in the community as well as leaders in the schools.

Communications and Human Relations

Jones (75) asserted that poor community understanding of educational practice might be considered the missing ingredient that leads to the failure of attempts to improve the program. A climate must be developed that is favorable for innovation. To accomplish this the public must be convinced that the allocation of time, money and personal involvement is worthwhile, and that it pays to wait until all the facts are in. This is the chief responsibility of the superintendent. The basic ingredients for such administration are: (1) that balance and stability are maintained in the schools: (2) that the public is given complete, reliable, and current information about the schools: (3) that the schools are in the hands of competent people in the board, the educational administration, and the teaching staff: (4) that change is the central ingredient in good education.

Kimbal (78) stressed that pervasive controversies stem from one or more of the following sources: (1) philosophical differences, (2) the limited state of the science of teaching, (3) social change, (4) social insecurity, and (5) vested interests. To combat these forces, effective communications must be maintained and a continuous evaluation of school needs, strengths, and weaknesses carried out. If this is not done by educators themselves, other forces will move in and do the job for them. Peterson (97) added that schools that have continued to inform the public honestly seldom suffer serious adverse or antagonistic criticism. Wilson (135), however, offered a note of caution that sheer publicity cannot hide the inadequacies of the school, but that a good educational program is not necessarily enough to establish good public relations.

Fountain (47) studied the difficulties of superintendents in school-community relations and pre-service training needs. He found that:

(1) Centralization at the state level and a lack of guiding statutes discouraged local leaders to promote local public support.
(2) Most local administrators do not use all available techniques for informing the public about the schools.
(3) Pre-service training is necessary for administrators to develop competency in developing effective school-community relations.

According to Carol (16) most college courses in school-community relations have not prepared administrators for their role as community leaders. Wilson pointed out that the success of the superintendent depends less on his scholarship than his ability to deal effectively with the public.

Not all difficulties originate outside the school organization. Fisher (46) indicated that some of the most dangerous problems arise out of relationships among teachers, administrators, and boards. The ways in which bargaining is being carried on in some places are more likely to

weaken than to strengthen the schools. According to Hechinger (67), the unswerving loyalty of the staff to the superintendent is nothing but a textbook myth. This myth suggests that all would be well if the superintendent could be protected from board interference. However, this overlooks the deep-seated antagonism present in many school systems between teachers and administrators.

Douglas (32) pointed out that the lack of communication within the professional staff is greatly hindering professional growth. Scott (112) indicated that the interpretation of policies change as they are transmitted throughout the various levels of the organization. Factors which influence these changes are: (1) the individual's position in the hierarchy, (2) agreement or disagreement with the policy, and (3) the individual's orientation and interests.

Decision-Making

The school administrator has one of the most difficult managerial positions in any type of formal organization. Kimbal (78) commented that, "... No matter what he does, nor what decision he makes, someone is bound to disagree, often strongly." Controversy, although neither undesirable nor unhealthy, too frequently reaches extreme proportions and, consequently, serves little useful purpose. This occurs when emotional claims become predominant in the discussion, and facts, sensibilities, and social needs are disregarded.

Jensen (72) stated that historically Americans have not been willing to define authority relations for decision-making in their organizations. This is evident even in the military organization. He identifies a number of conditions whereby power struggles develop:

(1) When decision-making is non-public to the person directly affected by the decision.
(2) When external social and economic conditions are changing drastically.
(3) When individuals use organizational resources as patronage to build power.
(4) When there are differences between personnel with respect to values and objectives.
(5) When outside organizations supplying resources demand an accounting of activities.
(6) When individuals in authority fail to exercise their authority to make decisions needed by the system.

Dykes (36) emphasized that administrators cannot function adequately without being able to relate themselves effectively to the community decision-making process:

> Every practicing administrator needs a keen awareness of how important decisions are made in his community, who makes them, and how he can relate himself to these persons in such a way as to influence their decisions. The administrator must do everything possible to assure that those who comprise the hierarchy of the informal power structure are informed about the education needs of the community and made sensitive to the importance of these needs to the community's total welfare. The administrator should identify community leaders who are outside the formal institution and agencies of local government, educate the informal leaders to the needs of the schools and the local educational program and be the community's educational program. The leadership effectiveness of the school administrator is in direct proportion to the respect and prestige which he enjoys in the community.

Lutz (87) stressed that it is essential for a superintendent to be aware of the power structure in the community which underlies the school board and influences the decision-making process. In general, superintendents have tended to believe that communication with the upper classes was sufficient to gain public support for the schools. This actually may be the least likely of all types of power structure.

Van Dorn (123) raised the question whether board members and administrators should be allowed to make policy without considering the needs of other branches of local government.

Administrative Organization

Harper (58) maintained that most school systems are bureaucratically organized. This is evidenced by the degree of specialization of personnel, the number of rules and regulations controlling the behavior of the staff and the number of levels in the authority hierarchy. This type of administrative organization seems to be increasing because of the expanding size of school systems, the changing functions of the schools, state and federal influences and the fact that society itself is becoming more bureaucratic. Buder (12) expanded this point as he stated that "... As school systems have grown, channels of communication and lines of responsibility have become more complex and sometimes obscure in a welter of administrative bureaucracy." Systems have progressively tended to lose contact with the public which they are attempting to serve. To combat this loss of contact some cities are dividing its system into major geographic areas, each with some explicit autonomy, but under the overall direction of the city superintendent. The natural trend has been toward consolidation, but decentralization is a new problem as central administrative offices are not eager to relinquish existing powers. Brownell (10) stressed the point that children benefit from administrative decisions that are based upon firsthand knowledge of local needs and problems. He stressed the need to involve citizens in seeking solutions to educational problems and to use their specialized skills and experiences.

Stumps (118) raised a number of questions which are directed to the problems created by the exploding population and the mushrooming of huge metropolitan centers. "How large should an already large school district become? How can instruction be decentralized while centralizing administration? How can the cogs of the inescapable bureaucracy be kept relatively

free from the sands of red-tapism?" He stated that bigness intensifies administrative problems. There is more militancy, more fund raising, more criticism, more intensive integration problems and more difficult communication problems due to the remoteness of the administration from the staff and pupils.

An additional problem faced by educators in the big city is the diminishing sense of professional status experienced by the teaching staff. Woodring (137) indicated that teachers tend to be swallowed up in the vastness of the system and soon learn to adopt an employee role. Decentralization is essential to counteract this situation, but it is no easy task:

> It will not prove effective, however, if the district superintendent retains a large measure of authority for himself and fails to delegate it to teachers. Formal education reaches its highest level of excellence only when teachers are given the individual responsibility and authority consistent with professional status and when teachers from the kindergarten level to the university graduate school are fully qualified to accept such responsibility.

The burden rests heavily upon the shoulders of the chief administrator for the professional status experienced by the instructional personnel. His behavior is of utmost importance.

Reed (103) studied the significant influential factors which affect administrative behavior and found that the administrator's beliefs regarding the function of administration affect his plan of organization, his duties and his leadership role in the community. The emotional control which he exhibits influences the quality of his leadership behavior. In regard to the delegation of responsibility, Reed indicated that "An administrator's understanding of his competencies and weaknesses influences the responsibilities which he assumes, and guides him in delegating responsibilities to others."

Talbot (119) added a little verve to his point as he stated:

> Virtually every city school chief in the country is beleaguered by many problems and he must cope with this oppressive work load virtually single-handed, for he has no really trusted lieutenants. Trained by textbook and seasoned usually in the relatively utopian schools of suburbia, the new man finds himself separated from his teaching staff by layers of hostile or apathetic administrators. Public officials in New York, Washington, and Philadelphia have told this author that the chief reason why the ablest and best intentioned superintendents accomplish little in the schools is a lack of subordinates whom they can fully trust.

Lindenfeld (86) studied the relationship between the size of the total staff and the size of the administrative staff. He found that as the size of the organization increases, the relative size of the administrative staff decreases. The larger the school system, the lower the ratio of chiefs to Indians.

Social Issues

Desegregation

Few issues have produced as many intense problems for administrators as desegregation. There are conflicting points of view among educators on almost any topic concerned with desegregation, and there is little agreement as to how these problems can be resolved or what the roles of the administrators should be in seeking solutions and implementing programs.

Star (117) reported that civil rights leaders in most big cities of the North feel that segregated schools are too often the poor schools. Some educational leaders in the North, however, feel that this is not true and they fear that this feeling might become a destructive sort of self-fulfilling prophecy. Walker (124) noted that most segregation in Northern schools is <u>de facto</u> segregation, and some educators claim that they have no responsibility to end segregation produced by non-educational factors within the community.

Commonweal (26) maintained there is evidence that school segregation resulting from racially inbalanced neighborhoods does injury to children. It confirms the sense of alienation from the white community, limits cultural and social horizons, and reinforces the ills of segregated housing. Newsweek Magazine (3) reported that one state commissioner ruled that one segregation caused damage to a child's personality. Walker (124) indicated that one large administrative problem arose from the fact that Negro students in a largely Negro school are as much as two grade levels behind their peers in a largely white elementary school in the same town. This raises the problem to administrators of how to integrate children of the same age who are two years apart in their achievement. Star (117) cited the problem that a white school's admission of Negro pupils results in an exodus of white people from the neighborhood.

A study of the schools of Washington, D. C. prepared by the superintendent of schools (Nation, 125) reported that the idea that desegregation will lower school standards is unfounded, as is the idea that desegregation will increase racial tension and juvenile delinquency. But it also states that desegregation is not the whole answer to the problem of the education of the Negro child. School dropouts are higher among Negroes than whites. Vandalism and pregnancies are more frequent. These children are frequently undernourished and are thus not in a state of readiness to learn. They may not only be unresponsive to their opportunities, but also aggressive, rebellious, and negative in their reactions. The conflict, disorder, and deficiencies in their homes influence the behavior of these children in the classroom.

Gibel (51) noted that the administrative problems related to school desegregation are highly complex. Negro parents do not want forced

integration of the kind being proposed. They feel that this will only continue to drive middle-class white children out of the schools. What they do want is a longer day, more and better textbooks that are representative of minority and urban groups in our culture, dedicated teachers of any color, smaller classes, and special programs which really serve the low-income child. Simply mixing Negro children from the slums with middle-class white children doesn't work in the schools. A dedicated teacher is essential for the motivation of slum children. This author also felt that all teachers in slum areas should be required to attend a seminar dealing with the history and culture of the minority groups with which they deal. They should learn to emphasize the positive elements in the minority culture. Cibel also suggested that an army of volunteers is needed to take over the non-teaching jobs in the schools, leaving the teachers time to teach. There should be remedial classes in ballet, art, cooking, sewing, and athletics. The track system should be abolished and children should be grouped in different ways throughout the day. New schools, whenever built, should be located in the fringe areas, as near as possible to the more expensive districts, to discourage wholesale emigration of middle-class white families from the school attendance areas.

Coles (19) presented a case study to show that community action and action on the part of Negro parents themselves may alleviate the problem of segregated schools with or without the assistance of the administrators. At times adverse administrative decisions have aroused parents to act and to find solutions on their own. Topkind (121) reviewed a similar situation in Mississippi which enlisted the constructive assistance of civil rights workers.

The Nation (113) reported that a volunteer community action group in Georgia, organized to maintain the schools in accordance with a Federal

Court order, did much to influence a favorable attitude toward keeping the schools open in a total of five of the ten districts where hearings on integration were held. Dykeman, et al, (35) concluded that when the issues are brought into open discussion and the costs of defiance are clearly stated, many Southern citizens will rally to support desegregation, if the alternative is a shut down of public education.

Bickel (6) found that administrators can expect little help from the U. S. Office of Education in the solution of their desegregation problems. Even though federal laws give the Office considerable authority, they are so understaffed that they cannot render aid to individual school districts. In addition to enforcement, the U. S. Office of Education can do little more than run training institutes and make special grants to school districts to operate various types of programs.

Walker (124) offered a variety of suggestions for improving the situation in segregated schools. These include provision of a central intermediate school with new techniques such as team teaching and non-graded classes, re-assigning some of the students from the lower grades to other schools in the district, and an open enrollment policy allowing highly motivated Negro students to transfer to other schools. Starr (117) suggested that an answer to the problem of segregation in large cities is to group elementary and high schools in "clusters." Other steps toward solution of the problems utilize special lessons for pre-schoolers, intensive teaching for slow learners, psychological counseling, and radio courses.

Commonweal (26) proposed other suggestions for a series of concurrent actions: (1) steps should be taken to redistrict schools to take advantage of the congruence of Negro and white neighborhoods wherever it exists, (2) bus transportation should take care of those children who are eager to

attend integrated schools, (3) a vastly accelerated program of school enrichment should be provided. The editor also stated that it should be possible to improve the present schools, even if this requires depriving some white schools of needed improvements.

Dykeman and Stokely (33) pointed out that although desegregation of schools can be brought about by the federal courts, true integration, it seems, can be achieved only by monumental and sustained efforts of goodwill and intelligence. These writers also pointed out that an element in the continuing school desegregation struggle is political leadership. When Southern political leaders continue to tell their people that a way will be found to circumvent federal court desegregation orders, they are encouraging futile resistance and conflict. It is suggested that we may need an agency to serve as a clearing-house between the federal government and the states, communities, and Southern leaders dealing with the whole process of racial desegregation and integration.

Dwyer (34) noted that the behavior of the superintendent of schools on the issue of desegregation can be of extreme importance. Although the course of desegregation in any community depends much upon public sentiment and the degree of opposition, in some communities there are no extremes in opinion regarding this issue. When that is the case, a firm, unhesitating stand by the school board and the superintendent seems to be the most effective approach.

Dodson (29) asserted that since the Brown Decision in 1954, superintendents have behaved with artifice, obfuscation, and fancy footwork in their effort to keep face with the power structures of their communities. Superintendents have not testified that segregated education is inferior; the rigid track system is used to enforce segregation; and in the South

competent Negro teachers have experienced unfair discrimination. Dwyer (34) found that the reluctance of school administrators to sanction research on the desegregation process within the schools is a major problem in determining the effectiveness of desegregation programs. They often impose specific restrictions, and cooperation can be withdrawn at any time. He suggested that the administrator is the crucial figure in any desegregation program. He can be a positive force in the movement toward integration, but if he is overly cautious and fearful, he may be instrumental in creating conditions which are conducive to tension and conflict.

The Culturally Deprived

Educating the culturally deprived student is another current social issue of major concern to the educator. The disadvantaged are doubly handicapped. The NEA Journal (37) pointed out that they cannot hope for reasonable success in their present environments, but they usually must obtain a new life elsewhere. O'Gara (36) found extreme differences between schools in slums and those in suburbs. A middle-class suburb may well spend twice as much per pupil for education as is spent on the slum child. The schools face an exceedingly difficult task in educating disadvantaged children, who frequently come from homes which leave them tired, hungry, ill, and emotionally unstable. Where physical punishment is common, children may learn that violence is their best weapon and often their only defense.

The NEA Journal (37) asserted that the values of the teacher and the very purposes of schooling may be appropriate for middle-class children, but not for the disadvantaged. Staff and student turnover is often high and morale low in slum area schools. Obsolete school buildings, commonly in use, are costly to maintain, yet they tend to be unattractive and lack

necessary teaching facilities. The problem here is that schools achieve their objectives only for children physically, mentally, and emotionally able to respond to them. Jencks (73) claimed that the key to the solution of the problem for these children is provision of a hope for respectable and responsible jobs. Too many are dropping out of school before graduation (more than half in many slums); too few are going to college (less than twenty percent in many areas). The fundamental problem is that the technologists are transforming work faster than education can transform workers. The slum school now is asked to do in one generation what was formerly done in three, and it can't do it.

O'Cara (96) indicated that it is extremely hard for even gifted and dedicated teachers to educate children born in the minority ghettos, but the local schools should provide a real chance to break down the old pattern, to allow the child to see over the walls that poverty and segregation have raised so high. Jencks (73) stated that the school is virtually the only organization in which the lower-class child can experience contact with the image of middle-class "work." Unfortunately, the school frequently shows such work at its worst rather than its best. The slum child learns that middle-class is, in essence, clerical and not professional. He comes to believe that success in a respectable job depends only on doing an infinite succession of meaningless tasks which he has no part in planning. Teachers don't <u>have</u> to appear to their students as clerks whose every action is controlled and checked by the "front office." They could be autonomous professionals who largely control their own day-to-day activities. If the school is to familiarize its pupils with the mainstream of American culture, it must provide the slum child with an alternative to the self-defeating style of his family and neighbors. Jencks (73) maintained that good

teachers must be recruited to slum teaching, but they will not stay if the principal treats them as irresponsible subordinates who must be constantly forced into a prescribed pattern lest they do something stupid.

O'Gara (96) stated that slum area schools must be drastically improved. Vocational training and apprenticeship programs must be expanded; doors now closed must be opened to job-seeking boys who have already left school. The successful school program attacks the problem of culturally handicapped on three fronts simultaneously. It demonstrates to pupils a close relationship between school and life; it includes the remedial services necessary for academic progress; and it arouses aspirations which can constructively alter the courses of young lives.

The NEA Journal (37) held that foremost among the needed qualities of the teacher of the culturally deprived is respect for the pupil. To provide a basis for that respect must be a major purpose of teacher education. Where schools face special problems, administrators must deal with special demands on school staff, facilities, and organization. In disadvantaged communities, especially, the school should become a neighborhood institution, for its success depends to a considerable degree on the parents' attitudes and on the staff's knowledge of family circumstances. Walker (124) proposed that an answer to the lower achievement problem of the culturally disadvantaged is to initiate intensive compensatory education programs in the disadvantaged schools.

Jencks (73) stated that finance is a difficult problem in slum education programs. So long as the origin of a slum lies in the countryside while the symptoms lie in the city, local action is not likely to meet the problem. Federal action is needed in such long-term ventures as education.

The most important single factor in shaping the alumnus of the school, according to Jencks, is the habits and values of his classmates. If the

school football team is the focus of the whole community's enthusiasm, the most talented students will become athletes no matter how many Ph.D.'s the school board hires. It has been suggested that we ought to send millions of college-bound, middle-class students into slum schools to serve as models for the slum students. The argument has been developed that to achieve integration of the classes within the school, suburban schools should be open to slum children. Financing poor applicants could be done by federal scholarships. Foundations might be approached to sponsor a pilot program such as this.

Jencks also suggested that private schools might best meet the needs of disadvantaged children. Tax relief is one possible way of encouraging such private school endeavors. At any rate, if any substantial number of slum students are to attend private schools, scholarships will have to cover not only tuition, but also books, clothes, and entertainment. Without such money, the slum child will be unwilling to venture into the affluent middle-class world.

Finance

Financing the public schools is a problem which is becoming increasingly important in the United States. An issue of U. S. News (131) pointed out that at that time at least two cities and one state were either in trouble or headed for trouble through lack of money to support their public school systems. To get new revenue for schools in these areas, tax authorities were reassessing property and hoped to have a new system in effect by 1966. An attempt was being made to assess all property at 100 percent of market value. The cases mentioned were used to demonstrate the fact that states and cities need to consider basic financial reforms for schools.

Chase (17), discussing the problems of city schools, held that high construction costs and lower taxable valuation per pupil together with constitutional and statutory provisions limiting taxing authority create real dilemmas in metropolitan centers. The property tax, the main source of local revenue, is becoming less and less adequate as a measure of the wealth of cities and as a source of revenue.

Support for the argument concerning the inadequacy of the property tax was given by Ernst (39) who maintained that the shifting base for our national wealth has left the country with a hopelessly obsolete tax structure. Property constituted at one time 75 percent of the national wealth, but is now reduced to 25 percent; yet, the property tax is the main basis for support of public education throughout the country.

Ernst (39) also emphasized other problems related to taxation. The brunt of federal taxation falls upon the corporations and the upper income families. State and local taxes fall more heavily on the average and lower income families. But what is most frustrating to taxpayers is that taxes are climbing just enough to enable the schools to stand still. The cost of education is expected to double in the next decade which will not be proportionate to the expected enrollment increases.

Part of the difficulty in financing the schools is a result of the budgetary procedures which must be followed. Hechinger (66) reported that in New York it has been urged that public vote on the school budget be replaced by a budget hearing only. The school board is the only government agency that must annually submit its budget to popular vote.

Wilson (135) expressed the opinion that the fundamental issue was not so much how much money is spent for education as the way money must be spent. The money has to be employed not with a view toward maximizing

educational benefits, but rather to keep the public happy and voting favorably. He also pointed out that one British headmaster and clerk can run a school of 1,800 pupils with little difficulty because the administrator is free from the necessity of attending huge numbers of meetings to insure positive votes on financial matters. This situation is the result of the fact that sixty percent of the support of education in Great Britain comes from the national government, "leaving educators to be educators, and not a combination of politicians, financiers, and public relations experts."

Furno (45) contended that not all of the increasing costs of education can be considered as a net gain for educational improvement; some of it must be written off as inflation. To keep track of this situation, Furno argues for a cost-of-education index which would measure trends in the purchasing power of the school dollar over the years and which would provide for automatic changes in state foundation programs to adjust for inflation and deflation. Such an index could set forth defensible fiscal policy at the state and local levels for the improvement of public education.

Federal support of education is one solution to problems in financing education. Ernst (30) supported his argument for federal aid with figures regarding economy and efficiency of collection. The federal government provides only 4¢ of every educational dollar, but it collects seven of every ten tax dollars. Only the federal government, Ernst argued, can fairly tap all states through corporate and personal incomes--the national wealth which transcends state lines. It is cheaper and more efficient to let Washington make the collection. The federal government keeps 44¢ per $100 collected while the state takes an average of $1 per $100 and local governments keep $5 to $10 per $100 collected. Ernst feels that federal

aid to education programs should be large and flexible enough to permit local school districts to spend the money according to their particular needs with a minimum of bureaucratic interference.

Disagreeing with the desirability of federal aid to education, Morely (32) argued that the thesis that the anticipated rise in costs makes federal aid to education both more desirable and more probable is debatable. To secure even the present degree of federal aid to education, there must be either more deficit financing, higher federal taxes, or offsetting economies in other fields of public expenditure. The federal tax structure is unable to carry the burden of federal aid to education unless other welfare measures and/or defense expenditures are cut down in the schools' behalf. He maintained that in the vast majority of cases it is not absolutely essential that federal aid be obtained to keep the schools operating. All that really is necessary is that local voters, acting through democratic processes, should authorize the desired expenditures. There is no doubt, according to Morely, that the local districts can raise all the money necessary for even inflated public school demands.

Bibliography

1. Allen, J. E. "The Big City School: Problems and Prospects: School Personnel and Educational Policy." PTA Magazine, 59:12-14, June 1965.

2. Ashby, L. W. "Don't Lose Local Control by Default." Education Digest, 27:22-4, October 1961.

3. "Balancing Act: End to Defacto Segregation in Public Schools." Newsweek, 62:48, July 1, 1963.

4. Beach, F. F. and Radliff, L. S. "School Administrators' Need for In-Service Education." School Life, 45:16-16, March 1963.

5. Ben Sen, Steven J. Changing Concepts of School Administration as Revealed in City School Surveys 1928-1950. Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University, 1953.

6. Bickel, A. M. "Speeding up School Integration." New Republic, 152:14-16, May 15, 1965.

7. "Biggest Push Yet for School Integration: Threat to Cut off Aid." U. S. News, 58:30-1, March 1, 1965.

8. Boorts, Nathan H. Cost of Educating School Superintendents, Lawyers, Dentists, and Physicians. Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation. Stanford, California: Stanford University, 1954.

9. Brownell, J. A. "Infirmities of Administration." Phi Delta Kappan, 41:53-6, November 1959.

10. Brownell, S. M. "Big City School Problems and Prospects: Keeping the Schools Human." PTA Magazine, 59:6-8, February 1965.

11. Bruce, W. C. "Chicago's Federal Aid Troubles." American School Board Journal, 151:67, November 1965.

12. Buder, L. "Outlook for Decentralization in Large Cities." New York Times, 9:1, IV, March 20, 1960. (Published in New York, New York.)

13. Campbell, R. F. "Conflict: A Reality of Administration." School Executive, 78:38-40, August 1959.

14. Campbell, R. F. "Control of American Schools." Elementary School Journal, 65:120-9, December 1964.

15. Campbell, R. F. and Sroufe, G. P. "Toward a Rationale for Federal-State-Local Relations in Education." Phi Delta Kappan, 47:2-7, September 1965.

16. Carol, Joseph. An Analysis of Professional Education and Functions of School Administrators in School-Community Relations and School-Public Relations. Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation. Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University, 1964.

17. Chase, W. W. "Problems in Planning School Facilities in Metropolitan Centers." School Life, 45:28-32, November 1962.

18. Cleary, R. E. "Conflicting Pressures: The Educator and Politics." The Peabody Journal of Education, 40:323-329, May 1963, Article II.

19. Coles. "Business in Boston." New Republic, 10-2:12, 1965.

20. Colins, David L. An Analysis of Public School Citizens' Committees. Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Temple University, 1956.

21. Coons, E. L. and McLain, R. W. "When the School Board Says No." National Education Association Journal, 49:59-60, January 1960.

22. Cunningham, L. L. "Superintendent in a Divided Board." School Executive, 79:601, November 1959.

23. Cunningham, L. L. "What's New in Administration?" Elementary School Journal, 61:57-67, November 1960.

24. Davis, E. W. "Extremists, Critics, and Schools." Educational Leadership, 23:53 plus, October 1965.

25. Davis, Walter. "Big City Schools in Crisis." American Federationists, 69:23-4, July 1962.

26. "Defacto Segregation: School Boycott of February 3, 1964." Commonweal, 79:583-4, February 14, 1964.

27. Dilworth, Richardson. "Needed: Integrated Schools." School Board Journal, July 1966.

28. Divizia, Margaret N. "Pressure or Planning: Which Shall Activate Change? A Summary of the Panel on Critical Issues in Audio-Visual Education." Audio-Visual Instructor, 9:80-81, January 1964, Article V.

29. Dodson, D. W. "School Administration Control and Public Policy Concerning Integration." Journal of Negro Education, 84:249-57, Summer 1965.

30. Donaldson, Marion G. "Educators and School Board Elections." Michigan Education Journal, 41:34-35, May 1964, Article VI.

31. Donovan, B. E. et al. "Collective Bargaining Versus Professional Negotiations." School Management, 9:69-75, November 1965.

32. Douglas, J. I. "Communication: Professional Necessity." School and Community, 49:16, April 1963.

33. Dunn, Joseph C. Some Factors Relating to the Loss of Teachers from the Public Schools of Missouri. Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation.

34. Dwyer, R. J. "Administrative Role in Desegregation." Sociology and Social Research, 43:183-8, January 1959.

35. Dykeman, W. and Stokely, J. "Integration: Third and Critical Phase." New York Times Magazine, 24-5, November 27, 1960.

36. Dykes, Archy. "Influencing the Power Elite." Education Digest, 29:28-29, October 1963, Article III.

37. "Education and the Disadvantaged American." N.E.A. Journal, 51:8-12, April 1962.

38. Ellena, W. J. "Issues that Should Concern the School Administrator." Phi Delta Kappan, 46:146, December 1964.

39. Ernst, H. W. "Financing Our Schools: Federal Aid or Local Taxes." Nation, 190:491.

40. Exton, E. "How will the School Boards Meet the Growing Federal Challenge to Their Leadership?" American School Board Journal, 150:5-6 plus, August 1965.

41. Exton, E. "More Federal Funds: More Politics in Education." American School Board Journal, 150:13-14, May 1965.

42. Exton. E. "Whither Federal-Local Relations; School Men in Painful Dilemma: 98th Annual Convention of the AASA." American School Board Journal, 152:45-8, April 1956.

43. Exton, E. "Will Increased Federal Planning Decrease Local Control?" American School Board Journal, 150:38-9, January 1965.

44. "Federal Influence Distorts Education; U. S. Programs Create Imbalance in Colleges." Nations Business, 51:31-3, March 1963.

45. Furno, O. F. "Should the United States have a Cost of Education Index?" School Life, 41:11-12, April 1959.

46. Fisher, J. G. "Our Schools: Battleground of Conflicting Interest; Adapted from Address, February 18, 1964." Saturday Review, 47:66-7, March 21, 1964.

47. Fountain Jr., Benjamin E. A Study of the Role of Selected North Carolina School Superintendents in School-Community Relations. Microfilm 59-47. Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina, 1958.

48. Fusco, G. C. "Public Schools in the Decade Ahead." Educational Digest, 26:1-4, May 1961.

49. Garber, L. O. "How to Free Superintendents from Negotiation Hazards." Nations Schools, 77:139, March 1966.

50. Garber, L. O. and Boyer, R. R. "State Decides What to Teach." Nations Schools, 74:26, December 1964.

51. Gibel, I. L. "How Not to Integrate the Schools: A Personal Testament." Harper, 227:57-60, November 1963.

52. "Dr. Gideonese Calls Local Autonomy of Small School Boards Greatest Weakness of System." New York Times, 35:4, May 25, 1960. (Published in New York, New York.)

53. Gilchrist, R. S. "Commercial Pressures in the School Program." Theory into Practice, 4:197-9, December 1965.

53A. Goldhammer, Keith. "Community Power Structure and School Board Membership." American School Board Journal, 130, March 1955.

54. Grahm, P. D. "Meeting Problems of the Rapidly Growing School District." American School Board Journal, 143:18-19, October 1961.

55. Gregg, R. T. "Political Dimensions of Educational Administration." Teachers College Record, 67:118-28, November 1965.

56. Griffiths, D. E. "New Forces in School Administration." Overview, 1:48-51, January 1960.

57. Gross, Neil. Major Pressure on the Public Schools in 1960. Oregon School Study Council 4:2. Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon, August 1960.

57A. Halpin, Andrew W. The Leadership Behavior of School Superintendents. Columbus, Ohio: College of Education, Ohio State University, 1956.

58. Harper, D. "Growth of Bureaucracy in School Systems." American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 24:261-71, July 1965.

59. Havighurst, R. J. "Chicago School Survey; Working with the Public." Phi Delta Kappan, 46:164-5, December 1964.

60. Hechinger. "Education: School Board Under Fire." New York Times, 9:4, IV, September 27, 1964. (Published in New York, New York.)

61. Hechinger, F. "Failure Up Front." New York Times, 7:1, IV, February 23, 1964. (Published in New York, New York.)

62. "Hechinger on Conflict Among School Boards, Teachers, and Administrators." New York Times, 8:1, IV, May 29, 1960. (Published in New York, New York.)

63. Hechinger. "Defacto Segregation - Two Approaches." New York Times, July 31, 1966. (Published in New York, New York.)

64. "Hechinger on Growing Reluctance of Citizens to Serve on School Boards." New York Times, 7:1, IV, February 16, 1964. (Published in New York, New York.)

65. Hechinger. "Rising Issue: Schools and City Hall." New York Times, July 3, 1966. (Published in New York, New York.)

66. Hechinger. "Sweeping Reform in School Boards is Urged on State." New York Times, 1:1, October 26, 1965. (Published in New York, New York.)

67. Hechinger, F. M. "Who Runs Our Big City Schools? Room for Whom at the Top?" Saturday Review, 48:70-1, April 17, 1966.

68. "Hell Breaks Loose in Paradise." Teachers College Record, 65:651-3, May 1964.

69. Hencley, S. P. "The Conflict Patterns of School Superintendents." Administrators' Notebook, Vol. VIII, May 1960.

70. Howe, H. "The Care and Feeding of Superintendents." Saturday Review, 45:58-9, February 17, 1962.

71. Ianni, F. A. J. and McNeill, B. D. "Organizing for Continuing Change." Saturday Review, 48:55-6, June 19, 1965.

72. Jensen, G. "Power Struggles in Educational Systems." Education Digest, 28:12-14, January 1963.

73. Jencks. "Slums and Schools." New Republic, 9-10:19, 9-17:13, 1962.

73A. Jensen, Gale E. "The School as a Social System." Educational Research Bulletin 33 (February 10, 1954).

74. Johnston, P. S. "Regional Approaches to Educational Problems." N.E.A. Journal, 55:27-8, April 1966.

75. Jones, C. V. "Developing Community Understanding for Educational Innovation." American School Board Journal, 149:29, July 1964.

76. Keeler, Donald S. A Case Analysis of Points of Conflict in School Board-Superintendent Relationships. Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University, 1962.

77. Kerr, N. E. "School Board as an Agency of Legitimation." Sociology of Education, 38:34-59, Fall 1964.

78. Kirbal, Roland B. "Controversial Issues Have You Down? Try Anticipation as an Antidote." Clearing House, 37:515-520, May 1963, Article VII.

79. Koch, Raymond H. An Analysis of the Functions of the District Superintendent of Schools in Pennsylvania. Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania, 1956.

80. Kowitz, G. T. "Change and Improvement of School Practices." Phi Delta Kappan, 42:216-19, February 1961.

81. Leggett, S. "New Views of Schools." Saturday Review, 48:93-4, October 16, 1965.

82. Lieberman, M. "Decline and Fall of Local Control." School Management, 6:29, November 1962; Discussion 7:50, January 1963.

83. Lieberman, M. "First Steps to Better Schools." Nation, 192:4.

84. Lieberman, M. "Let Educators Run Our Schools." Nation, 188:206-9, March 7, 1959.

85. Lieberman, M. "Teachers to the Union in New York City." Nation, 193:443.

86. Lindenfeld, F. "Does Administrative Staff Grow as Fast As Organization?" School Life, 43:20-3, May 1961.

87. Lutz, F. W. "Power Structure Theory and the School Board Decison Making Process." Education Theory, 15:19-25, January 1965.

88. McCarty, D. J. "Success in Effecting Innovations." New York State Education, 48:12-13, March 1960.

89. McDonagh, E. C. "Social Issues and the Public Schools." Sociology and Social Research, 48:90-5, October 1963.

90. Miller, V. "Four Definitions of Your Job." Overview, 1:50-1, November 1960.

91. Moffitt, J. "What Teacher Colleges Don't Teach Administrators." Nations Schools, 74:6, October 1964.

92. Morely, F. "Control Not Dollars is Real School Issue." Nations Business, 48:27-8, September 1960.

93. Morton, Raymond C. Turnover and Training of Missouri Superintendents of Schools. Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation.

94. Norby, Theo J. Perceptions of Superintendents' Competency by School Board Members. Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation. Stanford, California: Stanford University, 1955.

95. Nugent, D. G. "Are Local Control and Lay Boards Obsolete?" Educational Leadership, 22:85-7, November 1964.

96. O'Gara, J. "Schools and Slums." Commonweal, 82:551, August 6, 1965.

97. Peterson, Roberta. "Leadership and the Power Structure." Education, 82:232-234, December 1961, Article X.

98. Playforth, Rosco H. An Analysis of the "Place" of the Educational Administrator in the Social and Community Affairs Context of Two Kentucky Communities with Implication for Educational Administration. Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation. Lexington, Kentucky: University of Kentucky, 1960.

99. Pounds, Haskin R. Problems of School Administration as Perceived by Superintendents in Arkansas. Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation. Fayetteville, Arkansas: University of Arkansas, 1963.

100. "Pressures are Part of the Superintendent's Job." Nations Schools, 67:70-73, March 1961, Article XII.

101. "Race Troubles in Schools, South and North." U. S. News, 56:6, September 17, 1962.

102. "Radical Rights' Pressure On." Nation, 194:598.

103. Reed, Gerald R. Factors Influencing Educational Administration. National Association of Secondary School Principals' Bulletin, 46:101-107 Part II, April 1962, Article XI.

104. Rice, Arthur H. "The Next Twenty Years in School Administration." Nations Schools, 71:52-3, April 1963, Article VIII.

105. Rice, A. H. "School Men are Targets for the John Burch Society." Nations Schools, 75:30, May 1965.

106. Rice, Arthur H. "What School Men Face: More Status, less Security." Nations Schools, 73:16, February 1964, Article IX.

107. Rice, A. H. "Why Teachers Do Not Accept the Superintendent as Spokesman." Nations Schools, 75:36, April 1965.

108. Ryan, Elonzo D. How Superintendents Handled Specific School Situations. Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation. Columbia, Missouri: University of Missouri, 1953.

109. Scharer, N.; Peters, K.; and Kennan, R. D. "How to Cope With Attacks from the Fanatic Fringe; Interviews." Education Digest, 28:5-8, October, 1962.

110. "School Board Fight in Indianapolis; Citizens' School Committee Versus Nonpartisans of Better Schools." Christian Century, 81:597, May 6, 1964.

111. Schooling, H. W. "Teacher-Administrator Relationships." N.E.A. Journal, 54:32-4, February 1965.

112. Scott, Joseph L. Policy Interpretation Related to Levels of Organization in a City School System. Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation.

113. "Segregationalists' Threat to Close Atlanta Schools Backfires." Nation, 190:403.

114. Shafer, H. M. "Role of Administration in Policy-Making." American School Board Journal, 139:19-21, November 1959.

115. Sparks, Henry C. The Preparation and Experience of Alabama School Superintendents with Implications for Improving Preparation Programs for Future Superintendents. Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation. Tuscaloosa, Alabama: University of Alabama, 1965.

116. Sperber, R. I. "Federal Aid and Federal Control of Education." Teachers College Record, 61:331-8, March 1960.

117. Star, J. "Segregation Crisis: Chicago's Troubled Schools." Look, 29:59, May 4, 1965.

118. Stumps, W. A. "New World of Educational Administration." American School Board Journal, 152:9-11, February 1966.

119. Talbot, A. R. "Needed: A New Breed of School Superintendent." Harper, 232:81-2, February 1966.

120. Thomas J. Allen. "The Secondary Education Park: Value Synthesis in Urban School Systems." The Administrator's Notebook, November 1965, No. 3.

121. Topkind. "Bureaucracy's Long Arm." New Republic, 8-21:19, 1965.

122. "U. S. Wields Big Stick in Integration." U. S. News, 58:12, May 10, 1965.

123. Van Dorn, H. A. "Efforts to Keep Schools Out of Politics." Educational Leadership, 22:93-5, November 1964.

123A. Van Duyn. An Interpretation and Evaluation of Conferences, Conventions, and Workshops as In-Service Education for Superintendents of Schools in Michigan. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Chicago, 1953.

124. Walker, G. "Northern Dilemma Dramatized by School Integration Struggle in Englewood, New Jersey." Nation, 197:7.

125. "Washington, D. C. Schools Report on Desegregation Since 1954." Nation, 190:327.

126. Wayson, W. W. "Political Revolution in Education, 1965." Phi Delta Kappan, 47:333-9, March 1966.

127. Wayson, William W. "Source of Teacher Satisfaction in Slum Schools." The Administrators' Notebook, May 1966, No. 9.

128. Welsh. "In Defense of Public Schools." New Republic, 6-29:12, 1963.

129. "We're Buried in Federal Red Tape School Men Say. School Administrators' Opinion Poll." Nations Schools, 77:140, March 1966.

130. "What Education Needs." Editorial. New Republic, 11-27:4, 1961.

131. "Where There is a Crisis in the Schools." U.S. News, 57:8, December 28, 1964.

132. Wilde, S. "Pressure Groups and Public Schools." High School Journal, 45:119-24, 1961.

133. Willower, V. J. "Barriers to Change in Educational Organizations." Theory into Practice, 2:257-263, December 1963, Article I.

134. Wilson, Charles H. "Local Pressures in Education." The National Elementary Principal, 43:32-36, January 1964, Article IV.

135. Wilson, C. H. "On These Issues Superintendents Stand or Fall." Nations Schools, 75:27-9, June 1965.

136. Wilson, Charles H. "The Superintendent's Many Publics." Saturday Review, 44:49-51, October 21, 1961.

137. Woodring, P. "Breaking up the Big Systems: Plans to Decentralize Authority." Saturday Review, 48:51-2, July 17, 1965.

138. Wright, Robert C. Leadership Characteristics in American School Administration. Unpublished Doctor's Dissertation. Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska, 1956.